



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/613,422

07/02/2003

Lucy M. Bull

B500790

5145

23911 7590 02/16/2010  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
P.O. BOX 14300  
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

SINGH, PREM C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/16/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/613,422	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BULL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PREM C. SINGH	<b>Art Unit</b> 1797	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-18,21,22,25-27 and 30-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-18,21,22,25-27 and 30-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/21/2009 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1797

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 2, 5-18, 21, 25-27, 30, 31 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cain et al (US Patent 2,877,257) ("Cain") in view of Moore, Jr. et al (US 2002/0173556 A1 ) ("Moore").

4. The Cain reference discloses a process for removing metal contaminants from a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream. At least a portion of these contaminants would necessarily originate from the processing equipment and catalyst. The process comprises passing the hydrocarbon stream to a treatment zone where the hydrocarbon stream contacts an aqueous acidic stream that is passed to the treatment zone (i.e., extraction column). The acidic stream should have a strength corresponding to concentrations of sulfuric acids ranging from about 1.5 to about 50 weight percent. These concentrations would necessarily be within the claimed ranges. The resulting

Art Unit: 1797

mixture that includes precipitated solids is then separated to recover an extracted hydrocarbon stream and a modified acidic stream. The separation of precipitated solids should necessarily be using an appropriate device, including filtration. The acidic stream can comprise an inorganic acid such as sulfuric acid or an organic acid such as acetic acid. The acidic stream used in the process may also comprise the aqueous phase produced in the F-T process. This produced aqueous phase contains acetic acid. Also, the examples in the Cain reference clearly are batch treatments but it is also clear from Figure 2 that the process can be operated continuously. The extraction step is performed until essentially all the iron is removed from the hydrocarbon stream. This would necessarily disclose the limitations of claim 26 (See column 1, lines 15-36; column 2, lines 48-51; column 3, lines 9-35 and 52-75; column 4, lines 1-43; column 7, lines 41-73; column 8, lines 1-24; the examples, and Figure 2). Since Cain is using a process similar to the claimed process, it is expected that the size of the contamination is in a range including as claimed.

The Cain reference also discloses that acetic acid is used in the extraction processes. Therefore, such an extraction would necessarily produce a third phase as claimed.

The Cain reference does not disclose using a slurry reactor and temperature, a cobalt catalyst in the F-T step, size of the contamination, does not disclose that aluminum is removed from the hydrocarbon and the hydrocarbon product is paraffinic. The Cain reference also does not disclose the extraction conditions of claim 27 and

Art Unit: 1797

does not disclose passing the acid extracted F-T derived hydrocarbon stream to a hydroprocessing reactor and then hydroprocessing this stream.

The Moore reference discloses that F-T streams comprising primarily paraffinic hydrocarbons (See paragraph 0003) are produced in processes that utilize slurry reactor (See paragraph 0078), a temperature of 300-700°F (See paragraph 0076) and catalysts such as iron or cobalt (See paragraph [0079]). The Moore reference also discloses that F-T derived streams may be fractionated (i.e., distilled) and hydrotreated (See paragraphs [0047] and [0048]). Moore further discloses that the F-T catalyst generally comprises support materials including alumina (See paragraph 0079). This clearly indicates that when Moore is using a slurry reactor, cobalt catalyst and alumina support, similar to the claimed invention, Moore's product stream is necessarily expected to contain Al contamination in particulate form as claimed. Thus, Cain, while removing dissolved and occluded iron contamination from crude hydrocarbon solutions of oxygenated organic compounds present in the FT product stream (See column 1, lines 15-36; column 2, lines 48-51; column 3, lines 9-35 and 52-75; column 4, lines 1-43; column 7, lines 41-73; column 8, lines 1-24), should also be removing Al contamination in particulate form as claimed. Since extraction step in Cain's process removes substantially all the iron, the treated stream is expected to be free of foulants likely to plug the catalyst beds in the hydrotreating reactor.

Moore reference indicates that iron or cobalt catalysts can be used in the FT synthesis. Thus, both catalysts are expected to be equally effective and one can be substituted by the other.

Art Unit: 1797

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Cain by using a cobalt catalyst in the F-T step as suggested by Moore. It is expected that the Cain's process will be equally effective with cobalt catalyst also. See *In re Fout*, 675 F.2d 297, 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982).

It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Cain by distilling and hydrotreating the purified hydrocarbon stream as suggested by Moore because a stream with fewer undesired components such as olefins will be produced.

Although Cain does not appear to specifically disclose temperature and residence time in the extraction step, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize optimum conditions, including as claimed, for an effective removal of contaminants.

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cain et al. (US 2,877,257) ("Cain") in view of Moore, Jr. et al. (US 2002/0173556 A1) ("Moore") as applied to claims 1, 2, and 5-18 above, and further in view of Zhou (US 6,476,086 B1) ("Zhou").

The previously discussed references do not disclose adding a surfactant to the hydrocarbon stream.

The Zhou reference discloses a process for separating contaminant particles from an F-T derived stream. The process comprises contacting the stream with a composition that comprises a surfactant. The reference also discloses that filtration techniques have been used to separate solid contaminants from F-T derived streams (See column 1, lines 29-40 and 65-67; column 2, lines 1-67; and column 3, lines 1-11).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of the previously discussed references by adding a surfactant to the hydrocarbon stream as suggested by Zhou because the addition of a surfactant will enhance the separation process.

6. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cain et al. (US 2,877,257) ("Cain") in view of Moore, Jr. et al. (US 2002/0173556 A1) ("Moore") and Zhou (US 6,476,086 B1) ("Zhou").

With respect to claims 32 and 33, Cain reference discloses production of Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream by passing syngas to a FT reactor (See column 1, lines 30-54). Figure 2 of Cain invention also discloses that the downstream processing of the FT products is a continuous process. This implies that FT synthesis should also be a continuous process.

As discussed earlier, the Cain reference does not disclose that an additive is added to the reactor and does not disclose filtering the hydrocarbon stream after the adding step. The reference also does not disclose adding a surfactant to the



Art Unit: 1797

hydrocarbon stream or passing the F-T derived hydrocarbon stream to a hydroprocessing reactor.

The Moore reference discloses that F-T streams are produced in processes that utilize catalysts such as iron or cobalt catalysts. See paragraph [0079]. The Moore reference also discloses that F-T derived streams may be fractionated (i.e., distilled) and hydrotreated (See paragraphs [0047] and [0048]). Moore also confirms that the FT synthesis is a continuous process (See paragraph [0076]).

The Zhou reference discloses a process for separating contaminant particles from an F-T derived stream. The process comprises contacting the stream with an additive composition that comprises a surfactant. The reference also discloses that filtration techniques have been used to separate solid contaminants from F-T derived streams (See column 1, lines 29-40 and 65-67; column 2, lines 1-67; and column 3, lines 1-11). Zhou also discloses use of an internal filter for slurry-bed iron catalyst FT reactors (See column 1, lines 29-31, 50-53).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the process of Cain by adding the acid to the reactor because the same purification would take place with the added benefit of cost savings due to the reduced equipment requirement.

It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Cain by filtering the product

Art Unit: 1797

resulting from the extraction step as suggested by Zhou because filtering will remove any solid contaminants from the product.

It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Cain by adding a surfactant to the hydrocarbon stream as suggested by Zhou because the addition of a surfactant will enhance the separation process.

It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Cain by hydrotreating the purified hydrocarbon stream as suggested by Moore because a stream with fewer undesired components such as sulfur, nitrogen and olefins, will be produced.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 09/21/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. In the arguments on page 1/6-3/6, the Applicant argues that the product of Cain contains large amounts of *non-paraffinic species*. In contrast, amended independent claims 1 and 25 are directed to methods of removing contamination from a *Fischer-Tropsch derived paraffinic product* by removing Al contamination in particulate form.

Art Unit: 1797

The processes comprise conducting a Fischer-Tropsch process in a slurry type reactor using a catalyst comprising cobalt at a temperature range of about 400 to 550°F to produce a *Fischer-Tropsch derived paraffinic product*. The Al contamination in particulate form is removed from this *Fischer Tropsch derived paraffinic product*. Cain in view of Moore does not disclose or suggest a method for removing contamination from a *Fischer-Tropsch derived paraffinic product*. Cain relates to a process for the purification of *hydrocarbon solutions of oxygenated organic compounds* comprising acids. Accordingly, the product stream of the presently claimed process and the product stream of Cain are significantly different. The product stream of Cain containing large amounts of acids would react significantly differently than the presently claimed paraffinic product stream when contacted with an aqueous acidic stream. Thus, the phase equilibria established when contacting these respective streams with an aqueous acidic stream is completely different. Moreover, Cain in view of Moore does not disclose or suggest removing *Al contamination in particulate form*. In the process for purification, Cain extracts dissolved or occluded iron contamination from crude hydrocarbon solutions of oxygenated organic compounds with an aqueous acid solution. The acid extract retains the iron contamination in the form of dissolved chemicals including iron salts.

The Applicant's argument is not persuasive because Moore discloses that F-T streams comprising primarily paraffinic hydrocarbons (See paragraph 0003) are produced in processes that utilize slurry reactor (See paragraph 0078), a temperature of 300-700°F (See paragraph 0076) and catalysts such as iron or cobalt (See paragraph

Art Unit: 1797

[0079]). Moore also discloses that the F-T catalyst generally comprises support materials including alumina (See paragraph 0079). This indicates that when Moore is using a slurry reactor, cobalt catalyst and alumina support, similar to the claimed invention, Moore's product stream is necessarily expected to contain Al contamination in particulate form as claimed. Thus, Cain, while removing dissolved and occluded iron contamination from crude hydrocarbon solutions of oxygenated organic compounds present in the FT product stream (See column 1, lines 15-36; column 2, lines 48-51; column 3, lines 9-35 and 52-75; column 4, lines 1-43; column 7, lines 41-73; column 8, lines 1-24), should also be removing Al contamination in particulate form as claimed. It is to be noted that Moore discloses presence of oxygenates and olefins in the FT product stream (See paragraph 0003). It is also to be noted that the Applicant cites, "Hydrotreating refers to a catalytic process, usually carried out in the presence of free hydrogen, in which the primary purpose is olefin saturation and oxygenate removal from the feed to the hydroprocessing reactor. Oxygenates include alcohols, acids and esters" (Specification, page 12, lines 11-14).

9. In the arguments on page 3/6-4/6, with respect to claim 22, the Applicant argues that Cain does not disclose or suggest a method for removing contamination from a *Fischer-Tropsch derived paraffinic product*. As discussed above, Cain relates to a process for the purification of *hydrocarbon solutions of oxygenated organic compounds* comprising acids. Accordingly, the product stream of the presently claimed process and the product stream of Cain are significantly different. Cain in view of Moore does not disclose or suggest a method for removing contamination from a *Fischer-Tropsch*

Art Unit: 1797

*derived paraffinic product*. Cain in view of Moore does not disclose or suggest removing *Al contamination in particulate form*. Moreover, Cain in view of Moore does not disclose or suggest filtering the at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to remove at least a portion of the Al contamination in particulate form. Zhou is cited merely as disclosing using a surfactant and disclosing filtration techniques to separate solid contaminants. As cited, Zhou does not correct the many above-noted deficiencies of Cain in view of Moore.

The Applicant's argument is not persuasive because as discussed earlier, combined teachings of Cain and Moore disclose treatment of a FT derived product stream similar to the Applicant's claim. Also, as discussed earlier, Cain in view of Moore discloses removal of Al contamination in particulate form. Zhou also discloses a process for separating contaminant particles from an F-T derived stream (See abstract). The process comprises contacting the stream with a composition that comprises a surfactant, acid and water (See column 2, lines 11-67; column 3, lines 1-12). The reference also discloses that filtration techniques have been used to separate solid contaminants from F-T derived streams (See column 1, lines 29-40 and 50-53). Thus, Cain in view of Moore and Zhou discloses claim 22 as discussed in the Office action above.

10. In the arguments on page 4/6-5/6, with respect to claims 32 and 33, the Applicant argues that in no way does Cain, Moore, or Zhou disclose or suggest providing an additive to the contents of the Fischer-Tropsch reactor to precipitate soluble

Art Unit: 1797

contamination within the reactor. Applicants note that the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the process of Cain by adding the acid to the reactor because the same purification would take place with the added benefit of cost savings due to the reduced equipment requirement.

Applicants note, however, that it would not be practical or of added benefit to add a water solution of acetic acid to the Fischer Tropsch reactor. Fischer Tropsch reactions are conducted at temperatures of 400 - 550°F, as presently claimed. A water solution would significantly cool the reactor causing the reactor to need to be reheated to reaction temperature to conduct Fischer Tropsch reactions. Furthermore, a water solution would evaporate at the reaction temperatures, and thus, could not be used to extract the product inside the reactor, unless first the reactor was cooled significantly and then heated again to reaction temperature. The Examiner did not address why it is alleged to remain obvious to add the acid to the reactor in light of the above-noted problems in doing so.

The Applicant's argument is not persuasive because Cain discloses that the FT products have dissolved contaminants (See column 1, lines 15-19, 36-39; column 3, lines 9-10). Cain also discloses use of aqueous acid solutions to remove contaminants (See column 3, lines 9-35, 52-60). Moore discloses that the FT slurry reactor operates at 300-700°F (See paragraph 0076). Zhou discloses use of aqueous treating solutions such as alcohols, acids and de-ionized water to induce enhanced coalescing of the catalyst fines into larger clusters (See column 2, lines 4-30, 66-67; column 3, lines 1-12). Zhou also discloses the temperature of the mixture of treating solutions and the FT

Art Unit: 1797

product stream in a range of 10 to 250°C (50-482°F) (See column 3, lines 18-22). Zhou further discloses that the contaminants can be removed in an internal filter within the slurry bed FT reactor (See column 1, lines 50-53). Obviously, Zhou is disclosing use of aqueous acid solution in the reactor itself. Thus, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Cain invention and use the aqueous acid solution in the slurry reactor as disclosed by Zhou for contaminant removal in the reactor and thus reduce the size of the downstream separation unit.

11. In conclusion, the claimed invention is *prima facie* obvious over combined teachings of Cain, Moore and Zhou.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PREM C. SINGH whose telephone number is (571)272-6381. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PREM C SINGH/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1797